

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice to filing in a later application. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, and 9 have been amended. Upon entry of the above amendments and following remarks, claims 2-9 will be pending in the present application.

Allowable Claims 4-6 and 9

The Examiner has stated that claims 4-6 and 9 “would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims”. Applicant has amended allowable claims 4, 6, and 9 to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 depends directly on allowable claim 4 and is patentable for at least the reasons allowable claim 4 is allowable.

Claims 2 and 3

Applicant has amended claim 2 to depend directly on allowable claim 4. Claim 3 depends indirectly on allowable claim 4. As such, claims 2 and 3 should be allowable for at least the reasons claim 4 is allowable.

Claim 8

Applicant has amended claim 8 to depend directly on allowable claim 4. As such, claim 8 should be allowable for at least the reasons claim 4 is allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 1,683,990 to Schick.

Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice to filing in a later application. As such, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been obviated.

Claim 7 has been amended to depend directly on allowable claim 4. As such, claim 7 is not subject to a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 3, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Schick, and claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Schick in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,449,167 to Cohen.

Claims 2 and 3 respectively depend directly and indirectly on allowable claim 4. As such, claims 2 and 3 are not subject to a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 8 respectively depends indirectly on allowable claim 4. As such, claim 8 is not subject to a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In summary, the Applicant has addressed each of the rejections within the present Office Action. It is believed the application now stands in condition for allowance and prompt favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Hon Wang LEUNG

By: 

Guy D. Yale
Registration No. 29,125
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 13, 2005
750 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
(860) 527-9211
Our Ref: MCHK/143/US

G:\AYR saved docs\Filing Docs\M C H K\MCHK.143.US Response To OA of 10.07.04.doc